

REMARKS - General

The abstract and the specification has been amended to correct the 35 U.S.C. § 112 errors noted by the examiner, and to define the invention more particularly and distinctly. No new matter was added to the specification that wasn't claimed in the original application as filed. Claims 5-14 were cancelled and substituted with Claims 15-24 to clearly claim the method.

The Rejection of the Claims Under § 112 is Overcome

Claims 5, 6, and 9 – 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 6, and 9-14 were rejected for having no antecedent basis in the specification. The specification has been modified, providing an antecedent basis for these claims. This subject matter was claimed in the application as filed, and constitutes a clear disclosure of this subject matter per M.P.E.P. § 608.01(I), enabling the subject matter to be added to the specification.

Claims 5-14 were rejected for not clearly claiming the process. The claims were modified to correct this error.

Applicant submits that claims are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, since the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Bangerter et al (US 4,603,329) DOES NOT Disclose a Method of Performing Additional Ejection Sequences in an Injection Mold

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bangerter et al (US 4,603,329)

Bangerter does not disclose a method of performing additional ejection sequences in an injection mold and does not disclose the step of activating an ejection sequence if the molded article is detected in the mold. Bangerter discloses that if a part is stuck in the mold or die an appropriate stop signal is sent to the parts forming apparatus. (col. 2, lines 9-10) Bangerter discloses that if the sensors do not detect a part, and then detect its absence at the appropriate

time for such signal, the parts forming apparatus will be signaled not to proceed with its next step in the parts forming cycle. (col. 3, line 47 – col. 4, line 4, col. 12, lines 15-19)

Applicant submits that claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) since they are not anticipated by Bangerter et al (US 4,603,329) and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Lausenhammer et al (US 6,315,543) DOES NOT Disclose a Method of Performing Additional Ejection Sequences in an Injection Mold

Claims 1 – 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lausenhammer et al (US 6,315,543).

Lausenhammer et al (US 6,315,543) does not disclose the method of performing additional ejection sequences in an injection mold and does not disclose the step of activating an ejection sequence if the molded article is detected in the mold. Lausenhammer discloses that if an article remains on a machine core pin after the article ejection cycle has occurred, the machine is prevented from starting a new injection cycle and damaging the injection mold. (abstract, col. 2, lines 12-18) Lausenhammer also discloses that movement of the take-out plate is also prevented when an article remains on a core pin. (col. 5, lines 27-30)

Applicant submits that the claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) since they are not anticipated by Lausenhammer et al (US 6,315,543) and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

The Rejection of the Claims Under 35 USC § 103(a) is Overcome

Claims 1, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley (US 6,427,755) further in view of Lausenhammer et al (US 6,315,543) or Bangerter et al (US 4,603,329).

Applicant submits that the subject matter of these claims is not obvious over this combination of references because:

Lausenhammer et al (US 6,315,543) does not disclose the method of performing additional ejection sequences in an injection mold and does not disclose the step of activating an ejection sequence if the molded article is detected in the mold. Lausenhammer discloses that if an article remains on a machine core pin after the article ejection cycle has occurred, the machine is prevented from starting a new injection cycle and damaging the injection mold. (abstract, col.

2, lines 12-18) Lausenhammer also discloses that movement of the take-out plate is also prevented when an article remains on a core pin. (col. 5, lines 27-30)

Bangerter does not disclose a method of performing additional ejection sequences in an injection mold and does not disclose the step of activating an ejection sequence if the molded article is detected in the mold. Bangerter discloses that if a part is stuck in the mold or die an appropriate stop signal is sent to the parts forming apparatus. (col. 2, lines 9-10) Bangerter discloses that if the sensors do not detect a part, and then detect its absence at the appropriate time for such signal, the parts forming apparatus will be signaled not to proceed with its next step in the parts forming cycle. (col. 3, line 47 – col. 4, line 4, col. 12, lines 15-19)

Buckley et al (US 6,427,755) does not disclose a method of producing a silicone-injection molded article. Buckley discloses a method of producing castings with a shot of semi-solid thixotropic metal alloy in a die having one or more inserts that have a lower melting point than the solid-to-semi-solid transition temperature of the thixotropic alloy (abstract). For purposes of this reply to the office action, it will be assumed that the examiner inadvertently substituted the word "metal" with "silicone," intending the office action's last paragraph of page 5 read:

"Buckley discloses the method of producing a metal injected mold article (col. 6, lines 63-67), but fails to teach detecting the presence of molded article, initiating the next step, if the molded article is not detected, and activating an ejection sequence if the molded article is detected in the mold."

Applicant contends that this application solves a currently unrecognized problem. All referenced prior art requires operator intervention to correct the problem and reinitiate the molding cycle. This application solves this unrecognized problem by conducting subsequent ejection sequences and inspections to automatically correct the problem, and submits that the claims are patentable.


Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully,

 01/31/05

Neil Alex Korneff 01/31/05

21428 Bella Pine Drive

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Tel: 909-861-1213